

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael Brown, <i>a/k/a Michael Anthony Brown</i> ,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 2:19-cv-3194-BHH
v.)	
)	
Al Cannon Detention Center,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's pro se complaint. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On February 26, 2020, Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant issued a report and recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action without issuance and service of process pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Magistrate Judge explained that Plaintiff was given notice of the complaint's deficiencies and was given the opportunity to amend his complaint but failed to do so. Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to

which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 26) and incorporates it herein, and the Court dismisses this action without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

April 9, 2021
Charleston, South Carolina